

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

WELWYN HATFIELD COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE held on Thursday 27 June 2024 at 7.30 pm in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, The Campus, Welwyn Garden City, Herts, AL8 6AE.

PRESENT: Councillors J.Skoczylas (Chairman)
K.Gardner (Vice-Chairman)
H.Goldwater, D.Panter, R.Trigg, C.Watson,
B.Fitzsimon, A.Skottowe, I.Walsh, J.Cragg (In place of
M.Short), L.Crofton and L.Musk

ALSO Councillors J.Backhaus, Trowers & Hamlins LLP
PRESENT:

OFFICIALS C.Carter, Assistant Director (Planning)
PRESENT: G.Gnanamoorthy, Development Management Services Manager
R.Lee, Career Grade DM Officer
L.Mugova, Principal Development Management Officer
C.Cade, Governance Services Manager

145. APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were received for Councillor Shah for whom Councillor Crofton attended as a substitute, and Councillor Short for whom Councillor Cragg attended as a substitute.

146. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 7 March 2024 were agreed as a correct record.

147. NOTIFICATION OF URGENT BUSINESS TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER ITEM 12 AND ANY ITEMS WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA

There were no items of urgent business.

148. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

No declarations of interest were received.

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

The Assistant Director (Planning) provided a presentation on the overview of the role of Development Management Committee setting of the format and content of the meetings.

149. 6/2023/2552/OUTLINE LONDON ROAD WOOLMER GREEN

The Development Management Committee received the application which sought outline planning permission for the erection of up to 150 residential dwellings with the provision of affordable housing, public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point.

The application was brought to Committee as Councillor Cragg had called-in the application due to concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on highways safety and flooding.

Sian Wilding, agent for the application, addressed the Committee as follows:
"I'd like to thank you for allowing me to speak in support of this application today. I'd also like to thank officers for their professional consideration of this application."

Members will be aware that the application site is allocated for the development of 150 dwellings in the Local Plan and that the delivery of allocated size is highlighted in the Council's housing delivery test action plan as key to boosting housing supply and delivery in the borough. Our proposals fully comply with the allocation policy and other relevant policies of the Plan, including the provision of 35% affordable housing.

We have worked closely with officers to ensure that our proposals will result in the delivery of a suitable and sustainable development in Woolmer Green, whilst an outline application careful consideration has been given to indicative design principles to ensure that the proposal is sympathetic to its context and that the foundations are set for a high quality development to be achieved through a future reserved matters application.

As detailed in the officer's report, there are no objections from statutory consultees. The Local Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposed access arrangements from London Road are safe and suitable for the scale of development proposed, whilst both HCC and national highways have confirmed that the scheme would not have an unacceptable impact on the operation of the highway network.

We are aware of some local concern regarding flood risk, however, the Lead Local Flood Authority has thoroughly assessed our drainage strategy and offers no objection subject to the imposition of conditions. Our strategy not only ensures that there will be no adverse impact on either the site, or elsewhere from flood risk but offers the opportunity for a betterment to existing conditions.

Our proposals also include a range of other benefits for both new and existing residents of Woolmer Green including the provision of a pedestrian crossing over

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

London Road, improvements to existing bus stops and a contribution of more than 1 million pounds towards the County Council sustainable travel corridor scheme along London Road. In addition, the development will incorporate substantial new public open space, including new footpaths and a community orchard, and will enhance existing trees and hedgerows to create important wildlife corridors and green connections. Substantial new landscape planting will also be provided with a specific focus on where the site borders the Green Belt.

Further benefits include contributions towards improvements to the village playground, local sports facilities and local health services.

To conclude, the application proposals represent sustainable development and the principle of development has been established through the allocation of the site for housing officers have carefully considered all the relevant technical matters and concluded that on balance there are no unacceptable impacts or harmed that would justify withholding planning permission, we fully endorse the officer's recommendation and hope you can to thank you,"

Ros Naylor spoke against the application as follows:

"I'm speaking on behalf of the British Horse Society and also as a local equestrian. I have reviewed the planning application and note that no mention at all has been made over questions horse riders or horse-drawn carriage drivers. Also when the plan was being described on the east side is a livery yard at Payne's Farm which has been completely ignored. This proposed development lies adjacent to this.

In Hertfordshire there are 21,000 horses kept. Each of which contributes approximately £5,548 per year to the local economy, making a total contribution of 120 million per year to the local economy. Not to be sniffed at. People employed within the equine industry are riding instructors, groomers, stable staff, veterinary surgeons, equine dental technicians, equine physiotherapists, farriers, farmers, agricultural contractors, farming contractors, fencing contractors, saddlers, feed merchants, the list goes on. Horse riding and horse drawn carriage driving is an all inclusive activity and a totally diverse sport carried out by people of all ages between approximately two to 90 years old. Both by able bodied and people with disabilities.

It provides an excellent contribution to people's physical and mental health.

Horse riders and carriage drivers are considered being vulnerable road users by the government and should always be considered together with walkers and cyclists, but nothing has been said about them. This development will result in an increase in traffic along the local roads, not just London Road, making then use more hostile and hazardous by horse riders and horse drawn carriage drivers. We recently carried out a survey amongst the local horse riders and horse drawn carriage drivers, which showed that 86% had suffered vehicles passing them too fast, 66% too close, and 73% had suffered vehicles aggressively driving towards them. It's just not on. So as to mitigate against this, we request a legally enforced section 106 agreement with the developers to provide a sum of no less than £300,000 towards the funding of improvements to the local network of

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

restricted byways and bridleways by interlinking them with existing ones to provide long distance routes as well.

In addition, the funding will be used to improve road safety.”

Jed Griffiths spoke on behalf of the Woolmer Green Parish Council as follows:
“Jed Griffiths, Planning Consultant to Woolwich Green Parish Council, which has consistently objected to the development on this site, and we want to talk about two issues this evening, flooding and access from the B197.

Turning to flooding, the application recognises the issue of flooding on the sloping site. It's introduced measures to mitigate this by planting trees and installing an attenuation basin. However, the basin seems to be located further north and to the western side of the site, which is away from the main areas where the flooding accumulates. So it will not disrupt the flow of water from the slope, the [Parish] Council believes the basin should be relocated to a more central location, otherwise the flooding experienced now will increase rather than be controlled. This needs to be knowledge, it needs to be addressed, please developers talk to us.

The [Parish] Council does not believe that 150 dwellings can be supported on this site given the historic issue of flooding to the south of the site and in New Road. Photographs in our objection letter which you have in your packs demonstrate this.

Turning to access were unclear as to why the main access to the site is contrary to comments made by the Planning Inspector during the Local Plan examination. He stated during the hearing sessions that he was concerned about a further erosion of the Green Belt to provide an access road beyond the developed area of Woolmer Green, north of the chocolate factory. He also wrote to the Council saying I have expressed concern about the use of land in the critical gaps between rural Woolmer Green and Knebworth to avoid a vehicular access to the site from London Road.

He supported an access road going through the adjoining site HS43 which is currently occupied by a car dealership, but that's included in the Local Plan in the housing developments. The Parish Council supports that approach, it believes that it was included in the Local Plan as it states in the Local Plan “provision of a vehicle or access to meet the site and site HS43 to ensure good quality connectivity and permeability in line with sustainable transport for all”.

The B15197 is a very busy road. The junctions are where most accidents occur in Woolmer Green.”

The following points were made during the discussion:

- Concerns were raised by members on Section 106 monies funding projects in Welwyn Garden City rather than Woolmer Green. Officers

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

confirmed that there needs to be an identified project for Section 106 money and it was possible for facilities to be extended in other areas that were best placed to meet the needs of this development. It was noted there was a table in report which set out where Section 106 money would be used.

- It was clarified that developments are required to mitigate flood risks and that the proposed new homes would not see an increase/worsening of any existing off site flooding issues.
- Concerns were raised regarding traffic in the area. It was noted a transport statement was provided that stated there were no significant adverse impacts on highway safety. There was no objection raised by Hertfordshire Highways or National Highways.

RESOLVED

(unanimous)

The planning permission be approved.

150. 6/2023/2455/OUTLINE COLESDALE FARM

The Development Management Committee received the application which sought planning permission for the erection of 44 dwellings following demolition of existing buildings and structures at Colesdale Farm with all matters reserved apart from access. The development would be served by new vehicular access taken from Northaw Road West located approximately 15m west of the existing access. A second existing access to the south east corner of the site would be retained to serve Colesdale Farmhouse and to provide pedestrian and cycle access to the development site.

The application was brought to the Committee as Northaw and Cuffley Parish Council submitted a major objection.

The following statement was read to the Committee on behalf of Northaw and Cuffley Parish Council:

“This proposal represents a windfall site located in the London Metropolitan Green Belt, which is inappropriate in the Green Belt by virtue of the location, being outside of settlement envelopes, and a misalignment with national and local policies.

The former proposal, allowed at appeal, was approved in the context of the old Local Plan, prior to the Neighbourhood Plan coming into force and prior to the latest NPPF and adopted Local Plan.

This application must now be considered within this new policy context:

- *The applicant’s principal Green Belt arguments are based on a superseded policy framework.*
- *The revised policy framework, read alongside WHBC Local Plan Policy SADM 34, limits in-fill development to no more than four dwellings. Therefore, the site cannot be considered infill and has not sought to*

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

- reduce its development footprint based on the extent of existing agricultural structures.*
- *Welwyn Hatfield's Local Plan was adopted nine months ago, and it allocates sufficient land to meet local housing needs. The site is not required to deliver the market homes and affordable housing required locally based on the submitted housing trajectory.*
 - *The site is contrary to both the Development Plan and national policy, which recognise that the fundamental aim of Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain openness.*
 - *The site is washed over by the London Metropolitan Green Belt separating the inset settlements of Potters Bar and Cuffley, and neither the Local Plan nor Neighbourhood Plan allocate the Colesdale Farm site as a location suitable for development.*
 - *The development proposal extends into open countryside, and results in urbanising development in a countryside location. The Colesdale Farm site has no development in or around it to be justified as infill. The development proposal wouldn't result in the re-use of buildings or of previously developed land capable of:*
 - o *Having less impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development (NPPF paragraph 154 g)*
 - o *Not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt (NPPF paragraph 154g)*
 - o *Preserving openness and not conflicting with the purposes of Green Belt (NPPF paragraph 155)*
 - *The onus is on the applicant to demonstrate that Very Special Circumstances exist and that any harm to the Green Belt is outweighed by the scheme's benefits.*
 - *There is nothing in the applicant's submission documents that evidence how the development would not fundamentally harm openness or prevent urban sprawl.*

We believe that this application should, therefore, be rejected as inappropriate development within the Green Belt."

Estelle Friedman spoke against the application as follows:

"I've lived in Cuffley for 25 years and I wanted to come and speak about this as a Cuffley resident. Having read the application it states on the Council's Local Plan that the proposal will be permitted where it can demonstrate that services, facilities and environmental values are not affected. I don't think this can be done. We are already full and well over capacity and stroke in struggling in Northaw and Cuffley. We have a new development that hasn't taken into account the added Problems in our infrastructure. It is currently being built at the moment.

Firstly let's address the traffic, within less than a mile of this development we queue from Cuffley Tennis Club, which you saw on the map, to Botany Bay through to Northaw or Northaw West, from 8 am to 9 am, 2:45 to 4pm and then again at 5.30 to 6.20pm. We're queuing bumper to bumper every single day without fail.

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

The intersection with the site is already actually very dangerous, I was stationary there queuing to get out of the village and an artic truck reversed into me five years ago. It's so busy, it's such an awful intersection to have more traffic going there, and building work going there and then have people coming out of there, I think this is utter madness.

It states in your Plan 9.77 in the AM peak, 22 extra cars will be added to the traffic 20 extra cars in the PM. How is this even acceptable? I just don't understand. The new site is not included in these figures either. The road out of Cuffley Hill going into Goths Oak stationary every single day. The back roads leading out of Cuffley towards Hertford, which would be your cut through as we all know, they're full of potholes. I witnessed an accident last week that I believe was a fatality in that situation.

So basically, for people who don't know or don't live in Cuffley and Northaw overall roads in and out of Cuffley are blocked. It is busy all the time so I don't understand how that's not an extra strain on the infrastructure.

Going on to schools. The average class size in a Cuffley school is 30, the national average is 26.6 so we're already over. Doctors' surgery - you can't get an appointment for two weeks in our doctors surgery. There is no NHS dentist in Cuffley, so back to my original point it's up to the proposer to show how the infrastructure will be able to absorb this.

We are already at a critical point, it's not protecting the green belt, there is more traffic, we're already compromised, there's a detrimental effect on all the amenities and, more importantly, there is no need what is the need for this. That is simply my argument against this."

The following points were made during the discussion:

- Concerns were raised regarding traffic. It was confirmed no objection had been raised from the Highways Authority, and the County Council had been consulted who did not believe there would be a significant negative impact.
- The sustainable drainage of the application was queried as it was different to that of the extant permission. Officers confirmed that different strategies can be delivered for different application proposals and that the developer's drainage strategy now required a drainage basin.
- Concerns were raised regarding the lack of sustainable travel options in the area. Officers confirmed that the County Council had a number of strategies to address this.
- A member proposed that the entrance and exit access points should be changed. It was explained that the existing access point would be for the existing dwelling only. The main access would be in the position with the best visibility which for this site would be 15 metres from the current access point.

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

- It was noted that the development would reduce the commercial traffic in the area.
- The potential adopting of the roads by the County Council would be dealt with under the reserved matters application.
- The highways impact was being considered and was not found to be severe

RESOLVED

(9 in favour, 3 against)

The planning permission be approved.

151. 6/2023/2169/OUTLINE 32 ELM DRIVE

At this point in the meeting Councillor Crofton left the meeting.

The Development Management Committee received the application which sought outline planning permission for the erection of an additional dwelling with all matters reserved. The proposal includes a two-storey side extension which would form the additional end of terrace dwelling.

The application was brought to the Committee as Councillor Rowse had raised concerns that access to the site was restricted and the new dwelling would be unable to apply for parking permits.

Councillor Rowse spoke against the application as follows:

"I understand there are competing priorities to consider when deciding whether to improve this application. If the planning application is approved, then it will represent one further windfall development towards our Local Plan targets. My objection links to key principles of our Local Plan, which I've had great joy in reading recently, finally agreed last year.

Specifically, I believe this planning application is contrary to point 6 of our borough wide strategic objectives to maximise the opportunity to travel by sustainable transport modes and manage parking demand, and against point 2 of essay DM 1, the development will be accessible to a range of services and facilities by transport modes other than car.

The property is indeed served by two nearby bus stops on Woods Avenue called Elm Drive. The primary transport hub in Hatfield is the train station where you can both catch trains and access bus services to wider Hertfordshire unless there is only one service per week from Woods Avenue to the station. The 230 at 14.40 on a Wednesday. The only regular service is the 610 which is fine if you're looking to go to the University campus or perhaps Luton, but not for other destinations.

I cannot see how this is considered as maximising the opportunity to travel by sustainable transport. Officers refer to ready walking access to the town centre, but elderly residents and those with mobility issues would disagree.

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

Turning to parking demand, the plans do not include proposals for off street parking, and the Council's SPG's suggests a two bedroom dwelling house in this location requires one and a half parking spaces, and yet the residents of the new property would not be eligible to apply for parking permits. This might be seen as a disincentive for future occupiers to own a car. Although there are suggestions that an easy way round this is to seek agreement with your neighbour to register your car at their address before applying for a permit. So residents of the new property are likely to struggle with car parking and would not have ready access to public transport. In all likelihood, it would exacerbate parking for their neighbours. And, incidentally, two of the three HMOs in Elm Drive had no off-street parking.

Finally, I would like to comment on 12a Elm Drive, which is mentioned by both officers in their report, as well as the occupier of 10 Elm Drive in their rather ironic support of this planning application. 12a Elm Drive was approved before agreement of the Local Plan. Had this not been the case, then I believe 12a Elm Drive would not have received planning permission. Not only would it backfire based on ready access to sustainable transport, but also essay DM 11 point d a reasonable degree of privacy to new and existing private living space and the main private garden area with overlooking limited to an acceptable degree. That's not a problem with the proposal at 32 by the way, but it is a problem at 12a. As such 12a Elm Drive should not be used as grounds to justify approval of the new build in the garden of 32 Elm Drive as it was approved, before agreement of the Local Plan, and in any event, two wrongs don't make a right."

The following points were made during the discussion:

- A member felt that this infill development was a good idea and the Council would increasingly have to look at developments similar to this.
- Concern was raised regarding the eligibility to apply for parking permits as parking services had confirmed there would not be parking permit eligibility to this development.
- The location of the development was considered a sustainable location.
- A member asked whether a cycle shed could be provided but this would be considered under the reserved matters application.
- Officers confirmed it was not for the Development Management Committee to consider what the owner intended to do with the development if it was built.

RESOLVED

(8 in favour, 1 against, 2 abstain)

The planning permission be approved as set out in the agenda.

152. 6/2023/2133/FULL 26 HUGGINS LANE

The Development Management Committee received the application which sought outline planning permission for the sub-division of the site and erection of a 2-bedroom detached bungalow. The new plot created would have external dimensions of approximately 18m wide x 15m deep. The new dwelling would be

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

sited behind the existing dwelling with frontage and vehicular access obtained from Puttocks Drive.

The application was brought to the Committee as Councillor Zukowskyj had called in the application due concerns regarding to access to the site during construction and back garden development.

Chris Georgiou, agent for the application, addressed the Committee as follows: *“The application presented to this committee is the subdivision of 26 Huggins Lane and the erection of a new bungalow at the rear. We recognise the importance of maintaining an appropriate form of development and having worked closely with the Planning Officer we have put forward a proposal which respects the existing pattern of development and the character of the immediate area. This proposal delivers a high quality two bedroom bungalow for the borough. The proposal draws on precedencies from the immediate area. Similar bungalows can be found on the Huggins Lane and Paddocks Lane. The overall design of the proposals is sympathetic and appropriate in scale. The materials have been carefully selected to ensure that the development sits comfortably within its settings and that it is in keeping with the immediate character of the area.*

The proposal does not in any way cause harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light and privacy. The bungalow sits comfortably with an appropriately sized plot. The bungalow is well proportioned and offers a high standard of accommodation. It is believed that the layout is pragmatic and user-friendly. The layout has been designed to take into account modern day living and will provide future occupants with a sustainable development.

The development complies with all national technical housing standards. Furthermore, the development offers an functional and usable garden. It is considered that there will be acceptable to amenity for the new bungalow but also for the retained house at 26 Huggins Lane.

We have provided two parking spaces in line with local policy and will be accessed via a new double crossover. Concerns regarding visibility raised by the Highway Authority have been addressed and the vehicle to vehicle and pedestrian visibility displays are found acceptable.

The new bungalow has been provided with the appropriate refuse recycling and bike stores, and these are located to the side of the plot. There has been some suggestion from some local residents that the erection of this development would infringe access to Paddocks Lane and have an unacceptable level of disturbance to local residents.

In order to mitigate these concerns, the approval would include for a condition placing a requirement on the developer to provide a construction management plan which will outline a clear plan to avoid unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the highways. It is our contention that the proposed development is not harmful to the character and appearance of the area and the amenity of the adjoining properties. We would therefore respectfully ask this

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

Committee to support the proposal and grant planning permission for the development.”

Councillor Zukowskyj, ward councillor, addressed the Committee as follows:
“I brought this item to Committee because I thought it raised a particular issue around our parking policy, given that we've just approved a 2 storey house, with absolutely no parking provision whatsoever. I'm not particularly hopeful that that's going to be a having traction with this particular committee. I have to say I'm really quite disappointed that we've approved buildings with no parking provision whatsoever, and I think it sets a very dangerous precedent for developments going forward. How many houses with 0 parking are we willing to tolerate before we start to say no we have to provide parking provision.

The point here is that the officers reports, if you look at 9.29, says the application sites located within parking zone for parking standards require property with two bedrooms to provide 1.5 off road spaces. But it doesn't make clear is that the crossover removes an on-street parking place if it's only a single width wide. If the application, as you see it has a double crossover two spaces go, so the net gain in parking here is 0. That is not our policy, our policy says 1.5 off-road parking spaces So the officers interpretation of our policy is that is just the off road spaces. It does not take account of the loss of off road spaces that the vehicle crossover results in. We need to make a decision, I think tonight as to whether were we willing to accept just the off road spaces as matching policy or whether our policy should be the net change in parking spaces.

Personally, I would suggest it's the net change in parking spaces, in which case this application is not policy compliant.”

Officers confirmed the parking policy did not require the Development Management Committee to look at the net gain of parking space.

RESOLVED

(8 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstain)

The planning permission be approved subject to planning conditions outlined in the report.

153. 6/2024/0036/FULL 68 HILLCREST

The Development Management Committee received the application which sought outline planning permission for the erection of a part two-storey, part single storey rear extension and a single-storey side extension, following the demolition of the existing side extension. The application sought the existing two-bedroom dwelling increased in size to accommodate a third bedroom at first floor and a fourth bedroom at ground floor. The description of the proposed development and floor plans were amended during the application process to remove a reference to a change of use.

The application was brought to the Committee as Councillor Rowse had called in the application due to parking provisions.

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

The ward Councillor, Tim Rowse, addressed the Committee as follows:
“I wanted to stress that when I called it in it was originally against the change of use application, albeit they subsequently changed that I'll try and keep my objection brief.

Parking in my ward is under huge stress as car ownership is far in excess of what was envisaged when the housing was built. Matters have been exacerbated by the large growth in HMOs, many of which do not do not satisfy the parking requirements for off street parking of the special planning directive including the nearby 74 Hillcrest.

Officers say that there is currently under provision of car parking at 1.00 and a half spaces, and the proposals mean it was shoulder of a further one and a half spaces, so three in total.

The proposal is for a care home and whilst I doubt if any of the residents will need to park outside. I would expect their visitors to travel by car, as many of their visits are likely to be in the evening or at weekends when public transport is less available and parking is most stressed as few residents are at work.

My objection links to key principles of our Local Plan and specifically, I believe this planning application is contrary to point 6 of borough wide strategic objectives to maximise the opportunity to travel by sustainable transport modes and manage parking demand.

Furthermore, I believe it is reasonable to believe that visitors and residents struggling to park will have a negative impact on highway safety. This property is near the junction with Hazeldine Meadows.

At 9.3 1 of their report officers said that it would be unreasonable to expect the applicant to provide on-site car parking, given the constraints of the application site. I believe this fails to put sufficient emphasis on point 6 of our borough wide strategic objectives, and I believe there are opportunities to provide off street parking either the front of the building or possibly at the rear, which is accessed by the road running to the Council garages. We could, and we should be challenging this parking creep is a nightmare in my ward. I therefore suggest that this planning application could be approved, subject to the existing conditions outlined at 11.00 of the officers report, together with a further provision to provide off street parking for 3 cars.”

The following points were made during the discussion:

- Concerns were raised regarding parking in the area and the application not having off street parking.
- A member highlighted the importance of having a balance between granting applications for housing with sufficient parking, or public transport as this could be come an issue in the future.
- Concerns were raised about the height of the extensions and whether this would impact the neighbours. It was confirmed a comment had been

Development Management Committee
27 June 2024

received by the neighbour and the impact on the neighbouring property were included in the report.

- The property would be able to apply for parking permits.
- Concern was raised that parking implications could restrict visitors to the property which was intended to be a care home. Officers confirmed that visitor permits could be applied for.
- Concern was raised for regarding access for emergency services to the property. It was confirmed that the access would not be changed and would continue with what is already in place.

RESOLVED

(8 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstain)

The planning permission be approved.

154. APPEAL DECISIONS 27.02.24 - 18.06.2024 REPORT

The Committee received a report from the Assistant Director (Planning) setting out the appeal decisions for 27th February 2024 to 18th June 2024.

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the appeal decision report.

155. FUTURE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received a report from the Assistant Director (Planning) on future planning applications.

RESOLVED:

The Committee noted the report.

156. SUCH OTHER BUSINESS AS, IN THE OPINION OF THE CHAIRMAN, IS OF SUFFICIENT URGENCY TO WARRANT IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION

157. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

158. ANY OTHER BUSINESS OF AN EXEMPT NATURE AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN

Meeting ended at 22.25